

United States Patent and Trademark Office

A

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/826,809	04/17/2004	Armen B. Shanafelt	MSB-7273-D1	2913	
7590 01/13/2006			EXAMINER		
John W. Mahoney			MERTZ, PREMA MARIA		
Bayer Pharmac 800 Dwight Wa	euticals Corporation	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
P. O. Box 1986			1646		
Berkeley, CA 94701-1986			DATE MAILED: 01/13/2006		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary		Application	Application No. Applicant(s)						
		10/826,80	9	SHANAFELT ET AL.					
		Examiner		Art Unit					
		Prema M.		1646					
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communicat or Reply	tion appears on the	cover sheet with the c	correspondence a	ddress				
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failu Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAIL asions of time may be available under the provisions of 36 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communic period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, eply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ING DATE OF TH 7 CFR 1.136(a). In no ever action. ry period will apply and wi by statute, cause the app	IIS COMMUNICATION ont, however, may a reply be tim II expire SIX (6) MONTHS from lication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this o D (35 U.S.C. § 133).	·				
Status									
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed o	nn							
′=		 ☑ This action is n	on-final.						
3)									
,—	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.								
Dispositi	on of Claims	•	•						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-23 is/are pending in the appli	lication							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.								
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.								
6)[
7)	<u></u>								
8)🖾	Claim(s) <u>1-23</u> are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.								
Applicati	on Papers								
9)[The specification is objected to by the E	xaminer.							
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.									
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).									
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).									
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to by	the Examiner. No	te the attached Office	Action or form P	TO-152.				
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119								
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of:									
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.								
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No								
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage								
	application from the International		• • •						
* S	See the attached detailed Office action for	or a list of the certi	fied copies not receive	ed.					
Attachmen	` ·		_						
1) Notic	e of References Cited (PTO-892)	048)	4) Interview Summary						
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)			Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P		O-152)				
	No(s)/Mail Date	,	6) Other:	•	•				

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restriction

- 1. Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:
 - I. Claims 1-13, drawn to a IL-2 mutein, classified in class 530, subclass 351.
 - II. Claims 14-16, drawn to a nucleic acid molecule encoding a IL-2 mutein, a vector, and a host cell, classified in class 435, subclass 69.52.
 - III. Claims 17-18, drawn to a method of treatment with a IL-2 mutein, classified in class 424, subclass 85.2.
 - IV. Claims 19-23, drawn to a method of selecting IL-2 muteins, class and subclass undeterminable.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

Inventions I-II, are independent and distinct, each from the other, because they are products, which possess characteristic differences in structure and function, that is distinct for each invention, which cannot be exchanged. The polynucleotide of Group II can be used to make a hybridization probe or can be used in the production of the protein of interest of Group I. The protein of Group I can be used as an antigen to make an antibody, or used as a probe, or used therapeutically or diagnostically (e.g. in screening).

Inventions I and III are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (M.P.E.P.

§ 806.05(h)). In the instant case the product of inventions I can also be used as an antigen in the production of specific antibodies.

Inventions III-IV are independent and distinct, each from the other, because the methods are practiced with materially different process steps for materially different purposes and each method requires a non-coextensive search because of different starting materials, process steps and goals.

Having shown that these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification and recognized divergent subject matter as defined by MPEP § 808.02, the Examiner has *prima facie* shown a serious burden of search (see MPEP § 803). Therefore, an initial requirement of restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

2. Applicant is advised that the response to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a diligently-filed petition under 37 C.F.R. § 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(h).

3. The examiner has required restriction between product and process claims. Where applicant elects claims directed to the product, and a product claim is subsequently found allowable, withdrawn process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the allowable product claim

Art Unit: 1646

will be rejoined in accordance with the provisions of MPEP § 821.04. Process claims that depend from or otherwise include all the limitations of the patentable product will be entered as a matter of right if the amendment is presented prior to final rejection or allowance, whichever is earlier.

Amendments submitted after final rejection are governed by 37 CFR 1.116; amendments submitted after allowance are governed by 37 CFR 1.312.

In the event of rejoinder, the requirement for restriction between the product claims and the rejoined process claims will be withdrawn, and the rejoined process claims will be fully examined for patentability in accordance with 37 CFR 1.104. Thus, to be allowable, the rejoined claims must meet all criteria for patentability including the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101, 102, 103, and 112. Until an elected product claim is found allowable, an otherwise proper restriction requirement between product claims and process claims may be maintained. Withdrawn process claims that are not commensurate in scope with an allowed product claim will not be rejoined. See "Guidance on Treatment of Product and Process Claims in light of *In re Ochiai, In re Brouwer* and 35 U.S.C. § 103(b)," 1184 O.G. 86 (March 26, 1996). Additionally, in order to retain the right to rejoinder in accordance with the above policy, Applicant is advised that the process claims should be amended during prosecution either to maintain dependency on the product claims or to otherwise include the limitations of the product claims. **Failure to do so may result in a loss of the right to rejoinder**.

Further, note that the prohibition against double patenting rejections of 35 U.S.C. 121 does not apply where the restriction requirement is withdrawn by the examiner before the patent issues. See MPEP § 804.01.

Art Unit: 1646

Advisory Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Prema Mertz whose telephone number is (571) 272-0876. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:00AM to 3:30PM (Eastern time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Janet Andres, can be reached on (571) 272-0867.

Official papers filed by fax should be directed to (571) 273-8300. Faxed draft or informal communications with the examiner should be directed to (571) 273-0876.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Prema Mertz Ph.D., J.D. Primary Examiner Art Unit 1646 January 10, 2006